



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 5
230 SOUTH DEARBORN ST.
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:
SHS-11

May 15, 1991

Pamela Kay
531 Rensselaer
Griffith, Indiana 46319

RE: Sampling Results of Your Well

Dear Ms. Kay:

Enclosed you will find the results of sampling that was completed on your well by Warzyn Engineering Inc. this past winter. The results show that there were no detectable quantities of volatile organics (manmade chemicals) in your well. All the other private drinking water wells in your area which were sampled show the same results.

For your ease in the review of your well's results, I have included a summary of your well results and a short discussion of what the numbers mean to you. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me to discuss your results, or if you prefer, I can meet with you at our mutual convenience to discuss the results. My number is (312) 886-5116.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert E. Swale".

Robert E. Swale
Remedial Project Manager

cc: Reggie Baker, IDEM

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



267179

DISCUSSION OF WELL RESULTS FOR PW-10 & PW-10-91 PAMELA KAY RESIDENCE

In addition to the regular sample, the Kay residence also had the matrix spike duplicate analyzed on the water collected from the well. The matrix spike duplicate sample is used to determine how well the laboratory instrument can reproduce its reported results.

Volatile Organic Analyses

No organic compounds were detected in either PW-10 or PW-10-91 (the duplicate sample). Attached, for your review are the data qualifiers used. Note that with the exception of 2-Butanone, the remaining compounds were all reported as non-detectable (i.e., "/U"). The "R" designation generally means that due to some sort of matrix interference (i.e., something about the groundwater interferes with the instrument) the laboratory was unable to get a reading for this compound. This was a typical occurrence for many of the groundwater samples taken at the site. We have no reason to suspect that 2-Butanone is present in the groundwater at PW-10.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 5
230 SOUTH DEARBORN ST.
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604

May 15, 1991

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:
5HS-11

Cheryl Jansen
938 South Arbogast
Griffith, Indiana 46319

RE: Sampling Results of Your Well

Dear Ms. Jansen:

Enclosed you will find the results of sampling that was completed on your well by Warzyn Engineering Inc. this past winter. The results show that there were no detectable quantities of volatile organics (manmade chemicals) in your well. All the other private drinking water wells in your area which were sampled show the same results.

For your ease in the review of your well's results, I have included a summary of your well results and a short discussion of what the numbers mean to you. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me to discuss your results, or if you prefer, I can meet with you at our mutual convenience to discuss the results. My number is (312) 886-5116.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert E. Swale", is written over the typed name.

Robert E. Swale
Remedial Project Manager

cc: Reggie Baker, IDEM

DISCUSSION OF WELL RESULTS FOR PW-09 CHERYL JANSEN RESIDENCE

Volatile Organic Analyses

No organic compounds were detected in PW-09. Attached, for your review are the data qualifiers used. Note that with the exception of 2-Butanone, the remaining compounds were all reported as non-detectable (i.e., "/U"). The "R" designation generally means that due to some sort of matrix interference (i.e., something about the groundwater interferes with the instrument) the laboratory was unable to get a reading for this compound. This was a typical occurrence for many of the groundwater samples taken at the site. We have no reason to suspect that 2-Butanone is present in the groundwater at PW-09.

•